



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/670,616	09/27/2000	Masakazu Nishikawa	Q58116	6123

7590 06/02/2003

Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue N W
Washington, DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER

BERNATZ, KEVIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1773

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2003

61

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application N .

09/670,616

Applicant(s)

NISHIKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin M Bernatz

Art Unit

1773

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 30 December 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☒ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4-6,8-10,12-16 and 18-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the proposed amendment results in embodiments requiring further considered and/or searching. Specifically, the limitation "formed on both surfaces of said base material" was not previously claimed. In addition, the combination of the limitations: "a heat-resistant macromolucular flattening layer ... comprises at least one type of silicone resin, ...polyamide resin" and "wherein the linear expansion ... SSE/SUL > 1" results in a new embodiment which would require further consideration (i.e. the previous embodiment requiring the limitation "wherein the linear expansion ... SSE/SUL > 1" merely required a flattening layer, but did not further limit the flattening layer to be polymeric, as the proposed limitation would require).

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicants arguments are directed to the unentered amendment. In so far as they apply to the rejections of record, the Examiner notes that the 102 rejection under Okuyama et al would be overcome by the proposed amendment. The Examiner notes that the proposed claim language is similar to present claim 20 though the proposed claims present a different embodiment than any previously claimed.

The Examiner notes that applicants provide additional comparative evidence to illustrate unexpected results when a range in substrate thickness are used, but have not provided this in an affidavit or declaration format. The Examiner recommends providing the comparative evidence data in a signed declaration as evidence of unexpected results for the claimed thickness range. Attorney arguments are not considered evidence.

YMB
5/29/03

Paul Thibodeau
Paul Thibodeau
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700